

$(\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$ EQUIVARIANT MAPS BETWEEN REPRESENTATION SPHERES

ZBIGNIEW BŁASZCZYK, WACŁAW MARZANTOWICZ, AND MAHENDER SINGH

ABSTRACT. Let U and $\bar{U}$ be orthogonal representations of $G = (\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$, p a prime, such that $U^G = \bar{U}^G = \{0\}$. We prove that a G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ exists if and only if $\dim U^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^H$ for any closed subgroup $H \subseteq G$, thus simultaneously establishing a Borsuk–Ulam type theorem and its converse. Our argument in fact shows that the “if” part is valid for any compact Lie group G . This result is complemented by a reinterpretation in terms of divisibility of certain Euler classes when G is a torus.

1. INTRODUCTION

A basic problem in the theory of transformation groups is to find necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a G -equivariant map between two G -spaces. Perhaps the most well-known result in the necessary direction is the celebrated Borsuk–Ulam theorem [4], which states that if U and $\bar{U}$ are two orthogonal fixed-point free $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -representations, then the existence of a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ implies that $\dim U \leq \dim \bar{U}$. This result has numerous and far reaching generalizations, see e.g. [17], [18] for an overview. One such generalization, particularly interesting from the point of view of this note, is:

Theorem 1.1 ([13]). *Let U and $\bar{U}$ be orthogonal representations of $G = (\mathbb{S}^1)^k$ or $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$, p a prime, such that $U^G = \bar{U}^G = \{0\}$. If there exists a G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$, then*

$$(*) \quad \dim U^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^H \text{ for any closed subgroup } H \subseteq G.$$

On the other hand, sufficient conditions for the existence of G -equivariant maps between representation spheres have not been investigated nearly extensively. This is our starting point: we prove in Corollary 3.3 that $(*)$ is sufficient for the existence of a G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ for *any* compact Lie group G . It is not a new result in the sense that it can be extracted from the existing literature, see [8, Chapter II], although it is rather buried in the text. This, coupled with the fact that the second author has been inquired

Date: April 7, 2017.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 55S37; Secondary 55M20, 55S35, 55N91.

Key words and phrases. Borsuk–Ulam theorem, equivariant map, Euler class, representation sphere.

about converses to various versions of the Borsuk–Ulam theorem, makes us believe that it is worthwhile to carefully spell the details out.

A corollary to the discussion above is that if G is a torus or a p -torus, then $(*)$ is equivalent to the existence of a G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$. We prove in Theorem 4.2 that this is also the case for $G = (\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$. When G is a torus, our approach allows for a reinterpretation in terms of divisibility of Euler classes of U^H and $\bar{U}^H$ in $H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z})$. This last angle of research has been investigated previously in various guises, e.g. by Marzantowicz [15] (in the same setting, for G any compact Lie) and Komiya [11], [12] (with K -theoretic Euler classes, for G abelian compact Lie). However, in each case only the necessary criteria were described.

The last part of the paper has a somewhat different flavour. We leave the realm of representation spheres and derive a Borsuk–Ulam type theorem for $G = (\mathbb{S}^1)^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$ under purely cohomological assumptions on domain and codomain of the involved map. This is very closely modelled, both in statement and proof, on a result of Clapp and Puppe [6, Theorem 6.4], and allows us to complement our recent results [3] on the dimension of the zero set of a G -equivariant map $X \rightarrow \bar{U}$, where X is a homology sphere and $\bar{U}$ an orthogonal fixed-point free G -representation.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. Let G be a compact Lie group. If $H \subseteq G$ is a closed subgroup, then NH denotes the normalizer of H in G and $WH = NH/H$ the Weil group of H . Given a G -space X , write $\mathcal{O}(X)$ for the set of isotropy groups of X . If $H \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, then (H) stands for its conjugacy class, referred to as an *orbit type*. There is a natural partial order on the set of orbit types of X , namely:

$$(H) \leq (K) \text{ if and only if } K \text{ is conjugate to a subgroup of } H.$$

Recall that a finite-dimensional G -complex is a G -space X that possesses a filtration

$$X_{(0)} \subseteq X_{(1)} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq X_{(n)} = X$$

by G -invariant subspaces, with $X_{(k+1)}$ obtained from $X_{(k)}$ by attaching equivariant cells $D^{k+1} \times G/H$ via G -equivariant maps $S^k \times G/H \rightarrow X_{(k)}$, $0 \leq k \leq n-1$. The space $X_{(k)}$ is called the k -skeleton of X and the integer n is the (*cellular*) *dimension* of X .

Observe that if X is a G -complex and $H \subseteq G$ is a closed subgroup, then $X^H = \{x \in X \mid hx = x \text{ for any } h \in H\}$, the H -fixed point set of X , is both an NH - and WH -complex, while $X^{(H)} = \bigcup_{K \in (H)} X^K$ is a G -subcomplex of X . The cellular dimension of $X^{(H)}$ as a G -complex is equal to the cellular dimension of X^H as a WH -complex. We denote this dimension by $d_H(X)$.

2.2. Euler classes calculus. Let $G \hookrightarrow EG \rightarrow BG$ be the universal principal G -bundle and U an orthogonal G -representation. The *Borel space* $EG \times_G U = (EG \times U)/G$, where the orbit space is taken with respect to the diagonal action, is a vector bundle with base space BG and fibre U . Provided that this bundle is R -orientable for some ring R , its Euler class, denoted $e(U)$, is called the *Euler class of U* (over R).

Set $\mathbb{T}^k = (\mathbb{S}^1)^k$ and specialize to the case $G = \mathbb{T}^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$, $p > 2$. Recall that any non-trivial irreducible orthogonal representation of G is given by

$$V_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)} \otimes W_{(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell)} = V_1^{\alpha_1} \otimes \dots \otimes V_k^{\alpha_k} \otimes W_1^{\beta_1} \otimes \dots \otimes W_\ell^{\beta_\ell},$$

where the tensor product is considered over the field of complex numbers, and:

- V_i [respectively, W_i] stands for the irreducible complex G -representation corresponding to the projection $G \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ [$G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$] onto the i -th coordinate, $1 \leq i \leq k$ [$1 \leq i \leq \ell$],
- U^j denotes the j -th tensor power of a representation U ,
- $0 \leq \alpha_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $0 \leq \beta_i \leq (p-1)/2$ for any $1 \leq i \leq \ell$.

In particular, every non-trivial irreducible orthogonal G -representation is complex one-dimensional and admits complex structure. Consequently, the latter is also true for any orthogonal G -representation U without a trivial direct summand, and it follows that the corresponding vector bundle $EG \times_G U$ is integrally orientable.

The situation is different with $p = 2$ in that the vector bundle $EG \times_G U$ is not necessarily integrally orientable. However, in this case we can just as well work with complexifications. Indeed, let $U_{\mathbb{C}} = U \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$. Then $U_{\mathbb{C}} \cong U \oplus U$ as orthogonal G -representations and $EG \times_G U_{\mathbb{C}}$ is integrally orientable. Now note that if $f: S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ is a G -equivariant map, then

$$f_{\mathbb{C}}: S(U \oplus U) = S(U) * S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U}) * S(\bar{U}) = S(\bar{U} \oplus \bar{U})$$

given by

$$f_{\mathbb{C}}(tu_1 + (1-t)u_2) = tf(u_1) + (1-t)f(u_2)$$

is also G -equivariant. Hence if a Borsuk–Ulam type theorem holds for complexifications, it also holds for the original representations. Thus whenever $p = 2$, we implicitly assume that we are working with complexifications.

Now recall (p is any prime) that

$$H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}[t_1, \dots, t_k, s_1, \dots, s_\ell] / (ps_1, \dots, ps_\ell),$$

with $\deg t_i = \deg s_i = 2$ for all relevant i . Furthermore, $e(V_i) = t_i$ and $e(W_i) = s_i$. Using the basic fact that Euler classes are additive and multiplicative, we see that the Euler class

of $U = \bigoplus_{(\alpha, \beta)} r_{(\alpha, \beta)} V_\alpha \otimes W_\beta$ is given by

$$e(U) = \prod_{(\alpha, \beta)} (\alpha_1 t_1 + \cdots + \alpha_k t_k + \beta_1 s_1 + \cdots + s_\ell \beta_\ell)^{r_{(\alpha, \beta)}}.$$

In particular, $e(U) = 0$ if and only if U contains a trivial direct summand.

3. THE EXISTENCE OF EQUIVARIANT MAPS FOR COMPACT LIE GROUPS

Throughout this section G is a compact Lie group. We will be interested in the existence of G -equivariant maps between representation spheres. The main result of this section is Corollary 3.3, and the main ingredient in its proof is the following fact from equivariant obstruction theory.

Theorem 3.1 ([8, Chapter II, Proposition 3.15]). *Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer. Suppose that (X, A) is a relative G -complex with a free action on $X \setminus A$ and Y is an $(n-1)$ -connected and n -simple G -space.*

- (1) *Any G -equivariant map $A \rightarrow Y$ can be extended over the n -skeleton of X .*
- (2) *Let $f_0, f_1: A \rightarrow Y$ be G -equivariant maps and $\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_1: X_{(n)} \rightarrow Y$ their extensions. If f_0 and f_1 are G -homotopic, then there exists a G -homotopy between $\tilde{f}_0|_{X_{(n-1)}}$ and $\tilde{f}_1|_{X_{(n-1)}}$ extending the one between f_0 and f_1 .*

As a matter of fact, Theorem 3.2 below is also formulated in [8, Chapter II], but its proof is spread throughout the text. We provide what we believe to be a more accessible treatment for the convenience of the reader.

Theorem 3.2. *Let X be a finite G -complex and Y a G -space such that $Y^{(H)}$ is non-empty for any minimal orbit type (H) of X .*

- (1) *If Y^H is $(d_H(X) - 1)$ -connected and $d_H(X)$ -simple for any $H \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, then there exists a G -equivariant map $X \rightarrow Y$.*
- (2) *If Y^H is $d_H(X)$ -connected and $(d_H(X) + 1)$ -simple for any $H \in \mathcal{O}(X)$, then any two G -equivariant maps $X \rightarrow Y$ are G -homotopic.*

Proof. (1) In order to construct a G -equivariant map $f: X \rightarrow Y$, we will proceed inductively with respect to partial order on the set of orbit types of X .

If H is a representative of a minimal orbit type of X , then X^H is a free WH -complex. Define a WH -equivariant map $(X^H)_{(0)} \rightarrow Y^H$ by sending the 0-cells of X^H to an arbitrary orbit of Y^H and extend it to a map $f^H: X^H \rightarrow Y^H$ by means of Theorem 3.1. Since $X^{(H)}$ has a single orbit type, it is G -homeomorphic to $(G/H) \times_{WH} X^H$ by

[5, Chapter II, Corollary 5.11]. We can therefore saturate f^H to obtain a G -equivariant map $X^{(H)} \rightarrow Y^{(H)}$ via the composition

$$X^{(H)} \approx (G/H) \times_{WH} X^H \rightarrow (G/H) \times_{WH} Y^H \rightarrow Y^{(H)},$$

where the last map is given by $[gH, y] \mapsto gy$ (see [5, Chapter II, Corollary 5.12]).

It is straightforward to see that any two distinct minimal orbit types $(H_i), (H_j)$ have $X^{(H_i)} \cap X^{(H_j)} = \emptyset$, thus the above procedure yields a G -equivariant map

$$\bigcup_{(H)} X^{(H)} \rightarrow \bigcup_{(H)} Y^{(H)},$$

where (H) runs over all minimal orbit types of X .

Now choose $K \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ and assume inductively that f is defined on a subcomplex

$$X^{<(K)} = \bigcup_{(H) < (K)} X^{(H)}.$$

By construction, f takes values in $Y^{<(K)}$. In view of [8, Chapter I, Proposition 7.4], G -extensions of $X^{<(K)} \rightarrow Y^{<(K)}$ to $X^{(K)} \rightarrow Y^{(K)}$ are in one-to-one correspondence with WK -extensions of $X^{<K} \rightarrow Y^{<K}$ to $X^K \rightarrow Y^K$. However, the WK -action on $X^K \setminus X^{<K}$ is free, hence Theorem 3.1 applied to the relative complex $(X^K, X^{<K})$ results in a WK -equivariant map $X^K \rightarrow Y^K$. There are only finitely many orbit types, hence this process stops after a finite number of steps, producing a G -equivariant map $X \rightarrow Y$.

(2) Let $H \in \mathcal{O}(X)$ be a representative of a minimal orbit type. Since Y^H is path-connected, any two NH -equivariant maps $WH \rightarrow Y^H$ are G -homotopic. Therefore any two G -equivariant maps $(X^H)_{(0)} \rightarrow Y^H$ are also G -homotopic. It now suffices to successively apply the second part of Theorem 3.1 just as above. $\square$

As a consequence, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *Let U and $\bar{U}$ be two orthogonal G -representations with $U^G = \bar{U}^G = \{0\}$.*

- (1) *If $\dim(U^H) \leq \dim(\bar{U}^H)$ for any $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$, then there exists a G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$.*
- (2) *If, additionally, G is connected and for any $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$ we have $\dim WH > 0$, then any two G -equivariant maps $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ are G -homotopic.*

Proof. Let $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$ and note that the cellular dimension of the G -complex $S(U)^{(H)}$ is at most $\dim U^H - 1$, since this dimension is equal to the dimension of the orbit space $S(U)^{(H)}/G = S(U)^H/WH$. On the other hand, the space $S(\bar{U})^H$ is non-empty, simple and $(\dim \bar{U}^H - 2)$ -connected. Since $\dim U^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^H$, applying Theorem 3.2 concludes the proof. $\square$

4. EQUIVARIANT MAPS BETWEEN REPRESENTATION SPHERES

Unless otherwise stated, U and $\bar{U}$ are assumed to be orthogonal G -representations such that $U^G = \bar{U}^G = \{0\}$.

4.1. In this subsection $G = \mathbb{T}^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$. As a preliminary remark, recall that G has the so called *strong Borsuk–Ulam property*:

Lemma 4.1. *If there exists a G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$, then $\dim U \leq \dim \bar{U}$.*

This result is recorded in greater generality in [15, Corollary 1.12]. More precisely, it is proved therein that for any compact Lie group G , if $e(\bar{U}) \neq 0$, then the existence of a G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ implies $\dim U \leq \dim \bar{U}$. In our case, the condition $\bar{U}^G = \{0\}$ automatically implies $e(\bar{U}) \neq 0$ (see Subsection 2.2).

Theorem 4.2. *A G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ exists if and only if $\dim U^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^H$ for any $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$.*

Proof. Sufficiency is given by Corollary 3.3. As for necessity, $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ restricts to a G -equivariant map $S(U^H) \rightarrow S(\bar{U}^H)$ for any $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$. Since U^H and $\bar{U}^H$ are orthogonal G -representations with $(U^H)^G = (\bar{U}^H)^G = \{0\}$, we can apply Lemma 4.1 in order to conclude that $\dim U^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^H$. $\square$

Remark 4.3. Note that Theorem 4.2 can be restated with the phrase “any $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$ ” replaced with “any closed subgroup $H \subseteq G$ ”.

It is known that if a group G is not an extension of a finite p -group of exponent p by a torus, then G does not have the strong Borsuk–Ulam property, see [14]. It remains an open problem whether every such extension enjoys the strong Borsuk–Ulam property; this is not even clear in the case of non-abelian extensions of p -tori by tori. (We note that the proof of [14, Lemma 1.2] is incomplete and thus does not settle this last problem.) Our conjecture is that this is not the case:

Conjecture. *A group G has the strong Borsuk–Ulam property if and only if $G = \mathbb{T}^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$.*

What remains to be verified is that the following classes of groups do not have this property:

- non-abelian finite groups with exponent p , and
- non-trivial extensions $0 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow G \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell \rightarrow 0$.

4.2. **Refinement of Theorem 4.2 for $G = \mathbb{T}^k$.** Assume that $G = \mathbb{T}^k$, and let $U = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} r_\alpha V_\alpha$ be an orthogonal G -representation with a decomposition into irreducible components. We introduce the following notation. For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$,

- K_α denotes the kernel of V_α , and
- $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$ the connected component of identity of K_α .

Then K_α is a $(k-1)$ -dimensional subgroup of G and $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$ is a $(k-1)$ -dimensional torus. Furthermore, let m_α be the index of $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$ in K_α . The number m_α is in fact the greatest common divisor of the k -tuple $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$. In particular, it indicates whether V_α is a tensor power of another irreducible G -representation $V_{\tilde{\alpha}}$, where $\tilde{\alpha} = (\tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_k)$ and $\alpha = m_\alpha \tilde{\alpha}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \{\tilde{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and, for $\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, define $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^U = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{A} \mid m_\alpha \tilde{\alpha} = \alpha\}$. Geometrically, $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^U$ corresponds to the set of $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathbb{T}_\alpha = \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $U = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} r_\alpha V_\alpha$ and $\bar{U} = \bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} q_\beta V_\beta$ be orthogonal G -representations such that $\dim U < \dim \bar{U}$. Any G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ can be extended to a G -equivariant map $S(U') \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$, where U' is an orthogonal G -representation such that $U \subseteq U'$ and $\dim U' = \dim \bar{U}$.*

Proof. Let $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ be a G -equivariant map. Note that since $U^G = \bar{U}^G = \{0\}$, we have $U = \bigoplus_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}$ and $\bar{U} = \bigoplus_{\tilde{\beta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}}$. In view of Theorem 1.1, $\dim U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}} \leq \dim \bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}$ for any $\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, which shows that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$. Furthermore,

$$\sum_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \dim U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}} = \dim U < \dim \bar{U} = \sum_{\tilde{\beta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \dim \bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}}.$$

Consequently, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subsetneq \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ or $\dim \bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}} - \dim U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}} = d_{\tilde{\alpha}} > 0$ for some $\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1 \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Set

$$U' = U \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1} d_{\tilde{\alpha}} V_{\tilde{\alpha}} \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\tilde{\beta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} (\dim \bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}}) V_{\tilde{\beta}} \right).$$

Then $\dim U' = \dim \bar{U}$ and $\dim (U')^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^H$ for any $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U'))$. Indeed, if H properly contains a $(k-1)$ -dimensional torus, then $\dim (U')^H = \dim \bar{U}^H$. Otherwise, since $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}' = \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$,

$$(U')^H = \left(\bigoplus_{\tilde{\beta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} (U')^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}} \right)^H = \bigoplus_{\tilde{\beta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} ((U')^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}})^H = \bigoplus_{\substack{\tilde{\beta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}} \\ H \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}}} (U')^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}}.$$

But $\dim (U')^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}} = \dim \bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}}$ for any $\tilde{\beta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ by construction, hence $\dim (U')^H = \dim \bar{U}^H$. The existence of a G -equivariant map $S(U') \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ now follows from Corollary 3.3. $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *If there exists a G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$, then $e(U)$ divides $e(\bar{U})$ in $H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z})$.*

Proof. In view of Lemma 4.1, $\dim U \leq \dim \bar{U}$. If $\dim U < \dim \bar{U}$, use Lemma 4.4 to obtain a G -equivariant map $S(U') \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$, where U' is an orthogonal G -representation such that $U \subseteq U'$ and $\dim U' = \dim \bar{U}$. In view of [15, Proposition 1.8], $e(U')$ divides $e(\bar{U})$. Since

$e(U') = e(U)e(U^\perp)$, where $U^\perp$ is the orthogonal complement of U in U' , we see that $e(U)$ also divides $e(\bar{U})$. $\square$

Theorem 4.6. *Let $U = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} r_\alpha V_\alpha$ and $\bar{U} = \bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} q_\beta V_\beta$ be orthogonal G -representations. The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists a G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$.*
- (2) *For any $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$, the Euler class of U^H divides the Euler class of $\bar{U}^H$ in $H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z})$.*
- (3) *For any $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$, $\dim U^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^H$.*
- (4) *For any $(k-1)$ -dimensional isotropy subgroup $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$, $\dim U^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^H$.*
- (5) *For any $\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha: \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^U \\ m | m_\alpha}} r_\alpha \leq \sum_{\substack{\beta: \beta \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\bar{U}} \\ m | m_\beta}} q_\beta.$$

Proof. “(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1)”. Let $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ be a G -equivariant map. Choose a subgroup $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$ and restrict to a G -equivariant map $S(U^H) \rightarrow S(\bar{U}^H)$ just as in the proof of Theorem 4.2. It follows from Proposition 4.5 that $e(U^H)$ divides $e(\bar{U}^H)$ in $H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z})$. If this happens, then $\deg e(U^H) \leq \deg e(\bar{U}^H)$, which directly translates into $\dim U^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^H$. This last condition for any $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$ implies the existence of a G -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ via Corollary 3.3.

“(4) $\Rightarrow$ (3)”. Assume without loss of generality that $k \geq 2$. As exhibited in the proof of Lemma 4.4, for $H \in \mathcal{O}(S(U))$ at most $(k-2)$ -dimensional,

$$U^H = \bigoplus_{\substack{\tilde{\alpha}: \tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \\ H \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}} U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}} \text{ and } \bar{U}^H = \bigoplus_{\substack{\tilde{\beta}: \tilde{\beta} \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}} \\ H \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}}} \bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\beta}}}.$$

Since $\dim U^{K_\alpha} \leq \dim \bar{U}^{K_\alpha}$ for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, we infer that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$. Thus in order to wrap this part of the proof up, it suffices to observe that $\dim U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}} \leq \dim \bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}$ for any $\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Indeed, $H = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^U} K_\alpha$ is a $(k-1)$ -dimensional isotropy of $S(U)$ such that $U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}} = U^H$, hence

$$\dim U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}} = \dim U^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^H \leq \dim \bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}.$$

“(4) $\Leftrightarrow$ (5)”. Note that if we view $U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}$ and $\bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}$ as representations of $\mathbb{S}^1 = G/\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}$, then (4) can be rephrased as $\dim (U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}})^{\mathbb{Z}_m} \leq \dim (\bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}})^{\mathbb{Z}_m}$ for any $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. But

$$(U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}})^{\mathbb{Z}_m} = \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha: \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^U \\ m | m_\alpha}} r_\alpha V_\alpha,$$

which shows that

$$\dim(U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}})^{\mathbb{Z}_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha: \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^U \\ m \mid m_\alpha}} r_\alpha.$$

An analogous thing happens for $\bar{U}$, which concludes the proof. $\square$

Remark 4.7. The implication “(4) $\Rightarrow$ (3)” can be seen in a more geometrical manner. As observed above, (4) amounts precisely to the condition $(*)$ for $U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}$ and $\bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}$ viewed as representations of $\mathbb{S}^1 = G/\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}$, for any $\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Therefore Corollary 3.3 implies the existence of an $\mathbb{S}^1$ -equivariant map $f^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}: S(U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}) \rightarrow S(\bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}})$, which can be considered as a G -equivariant map. Consequently, the join construction

$$S(U) = S\left(\bigoplus_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}\right) = \bigstar_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} S(U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}) \longrightarrow \bigstar_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} S(\bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}) = S\left(\bigoplus_{\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}\right) \subseteq S(\bar{U})$$

yields the desired G -equivariant map.

On a related note, the implication “(5) $\Rightarrow$ (2)” is a purely algebraic fact and can be derived directly, without any geometrical interpretation. We would like to thank A. Schinzel for suggesting the following argument to us.

Suppose that (5) is satisfied and fix $\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. We will show that

$$e(U^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}) = \prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^U} (\alpha_1 t_1 + \cdots + \alpha_k t_k)^{r_\alpha} = \left(\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^U} m_\alpha^{r_\alpha} \right) (\tilde{\alpha}_1 t_1 + \cdots + \tilde{\alpha}_k t_k)^{\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^U} r_\alpha}$$

divides

$$e(\bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_{\tilde{\alpha}}}) = \left(\prod_{\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{\bar{U}}} m_\beta^{q_\beta} \right) (\tilde{\alpha}_1 t_1 + \cdots + \tilde{\alpha}_k t_k)^{\sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{\bar{U}}} q_\beta}.$$

If $m = 1$, then (5) yields $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^U} r_\alpha \leq \sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{\bar{U}}} q_\beta$, thus it suffices to prove that $\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^U} m_\alpha^{r_\alpha}$ divides $\prod_{\beta \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^{\bar{U}}} m_\beta^{q_\beta}$.

Let m be the highest power of a prime p appearing in any of m_α 's. Observe that p appears in $\prod_{\alpha \in \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{\alpha}}^U} m_\alpha^{r_\alpha}$ with the power

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \sum_{\substack{p \mid m_\alpha \\ p^2 \nmid m_\alpha}} r_\alpha + 2 \sum_{\substack{p^2 \mid m_\alpha \\ p^3 \nmid m_\alpha}} r_\alpha + \cdots + n \sum_{p^n \mid m_\alpha} r_\alpha \\ &= \sum_{p \mid m_\alpha} r_\alpha + \sum_{\substack{p^2 \mid m_\alpha \\ p^3 \nmid m_\alpha}} r_\alpha + 2 \sum_{\substack{p^3 \mid m_\alpha \\ p^4 \nmid m_\alpha}} r_\alpha + \cdots + (n-1) \sum_{p^n \mid m_\alpha} r_\alpha = \cdots \\ &= \sum_{p \mid m_\alpha} r_\alpha + \sum_{p^2 \mid m_\alpha} r_\alpha + \cdots + \sum_{p^n \mid m_\alpha} r_\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where α varies over $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^U$. Likewise, if n is the highest power of p appearing in any of m_β 's, then p appears in $\prod_{\beta \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\bar{U}}} m_\beta^{q_\beta}$ with the power

$$N = \sum_{p \mid m_\beta} q_\beta + \sum_{p^2 \mid m_\beta} q_\beta + \cdots + \sum_{p^n \mid m_\beta} q_\beta,$$

where β varies over $\mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\bar{U}}$. By assumption, for any $i \geq 0$,

$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha: \alpha \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^U \\ p^i \mid m_\alpha}} r_\alpha \leq \sum_{\substack{\beta: \beta \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha^{\bar{U}} \\ p^i \mid m_\beta}} q_\beta,$$

hence $M \leq N$. This shows that, for any prime p , the power of p which appears in the decomposition of $e(U^{\mathbb{T}_\alpha})$ does not exceed the one which appears in the decomposition of $e(\bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_\alpha})$. Therefore $e(U^{\mathbb{T}_\alpha})$ divides $e(\bar{U}^{\mathbb{T}_\alpha})$. Consequently, using the fact that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$, $e(U) = \prod_{\alpha \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} e(U^{\mathbb{T}_\alpha})$ divides $e(\bar{U}) = \prod_{\beta \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} e(U^{\mathbb{T}_\beta})$. A similar argument shows that the same thing happens for $e(U^H)$ and $e(\bar{U}^H)$.

The second author asked the following question in [15, Problem 2.6]. Given orthogonal $\mathbb{S}^1$ -representations U and $\bar{U}$ with $U^{\mathbb{S}^1} = \bar{U}^{\mathbb{S}^1} = \{0\}$, is divisibility of $e(\bar{U})$ by $e(U)$ sufficient for the existence of an $\mathbb{S}^1$ -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$? The following example shows that the answer is negative in general.

Example 4.8. Let V be the one-dimensional fixed-point free $\mathbb{S}^1$ -representation. Define $U = 2V^3 \oplus V^5$ and $\bar{U} = V^{18} \oplus 2V^5$. Then $e(U) = 45t^3$ divides $e(\bar{U}) = 450t^3$, but the existence of an $\mathbb{S}^1$ -equivariant map $S(U) \rightarrow S(\bar{U})$ would violate Theorem 4.6, as $\dim U^{\mathbb{Z}_3} = 2 > 1 = \dim \bar{U}^{\mathbb{Z}_3}$.

5. A “CLAPP–PUPPE VERSION” OF THE BU THEOREM FOR $G = \mathbb{T}^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$

We reinstate the notation $G = \mathbb{T}^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$. The following result constitutes a substantial generalization of Lemma 4.1.

Theorem 5.1. *Let X be a path-connected G -space and Y a finite-dimensional G -complex with an empty fixed point set and finitely many orbit types. If, for some $n \geq 1$,*

- (1) $H^i(X; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ for $0 < i < n$, and
- (2) $H^i(Y; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ for $i \geq n$,

then there is no G -equivariant map $X \rightarrow Y$.

This is a Borsuk–Ulam type theorem in the spirit of Clapp and Puppe [6, Theorem 6.4], who proved an analogous result for G either a torus or a p -torus. The p -torus case was also

obtained by Assadi [2, Section 2] with different methods. The Clapp–Puppe proof works just as well in our case as soon as we prove the following localization theorem.

Proposition 5.2. *Let X be a finite-dimensional G -complex with finitely many orbit types. If S is a multiplicative system in $H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z})$ which consists of 1 and Euler classes of complex G -representations without a trivial summand, then the localized restriction homomorphism*

$$S^{-1}H_G^*(X; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow S^{-1}H_G^*(X^G; \mathbb{Z})$$

is an isomorphism.

While completing this paper, we learned that the above result is recorded in Jackowski's PhD thesis [9]. As a matter of fact, it is proved therein that $S^{-1}h_G^*(X) \rightarrow S^{-1}h_G^*(X^G)$ is an isomorphism for any compact Lie group G and any multiplicative cohomology theory h^* (h_G^* denotes the equivariant cohomology theory defined out of h^* by means of the classifying principal G -bundle). However, $S^{-1}h_G^*(\text{pt}) = 0$ for G non-abelian by [7], which deems the result uninteresting outside the realm of abelian groups. On the other hand, $S^{-1}H_G^*(\text{pt}; \mathbb{Z}) = S^{-1}H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$ if and only if $G = \mathbb{T}^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$, see [10, Theorem 1.2].

Since [9] is available only in Polish, and we have not been able to find an explicit statement of Proposition 5.2 elsewhere, we spell its proof out below.

Proof. Let

$$X^S = \{x \in X \mid S \cap \ker[H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^*(BG_x; \mathbb{Z})] = \emptyset\}.$$

By [1, Theorem 3.1.6], the inclusion $X^S \hookrightarrow X$ induces an isomorphism $S^{-1}H_G^*(X; \mathbb{Z}) \cong S^{-1}H_G^*(X^S; \mathbb{Z})$. Hence it suffices to prove that $S \cap \ker[H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^*(BH; \mathbb{Z})]$ is non-empty for all subgroups $H \subsetneq G$, for then $X^S = X^G$. But any $H \subsetneq G$ lies in the kernel K of a non-trivial irreducible complex G -representation $V_\alpha \otimes W_\beta$ for some α, β , and $e(V_\alpha \otimes W_\beta) \neq 0$ lies in $\ker[H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^*(BK; \mathbb{Z})]$, hence also in $\ker[H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^*(BH; \mathbb{Z})]$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Suppose, on the contrary, that there exists a G -equivariant map $f: X \rightarrow Y$. Then f induces a fiberwise map of the Borel constructions.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} EG \times_G X & \xrightarrow{\quad} & EG \times_G Y \\ & \searrow p_X \quad \swarrow p_Y & \\ & BG & \end{array}$$

Let $h = h_r^{s,t}$ be the corresponding map between Serre spectral sequences (E, d) and $(\bar{E}, \bar{d})$ of p_X^* and p_Y^* , respectively.

Note that since Y is fixed-point free, $p_Y^*: H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_G^*(Y; \mathbb{Z})$ cannot be injective. Indeed, if p_Y^* is injective, so is $S^{-1}p_Y^*$. But, as already mentioned, $S^{-1}H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$, hence $S^{-1}H_G^*(Y; \mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$. Proposition 5.2 now implies the existence of a fixed point in Y .

Therefore there exists a non-zero element $\alpha \in H^s(BG; \mathbb{Z})$ such that $p_Y^*(\alpha) = 0$. But p_Y^* factors as the edge homomorphism

$$H^*(BG; \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \bar{E}_2^{s,0} \longrightarrow \bar{E}_\infty^{s,0} \hookrightarrow H_G^*(Y; \mathbb{Z}),$$

hence the image α_r of α in $\bar{E}_r^{s,0}$ is zero for some $r \geq 2$. Let r be maximal with $\alpha_r \neq 0$, so that $\bar{d}_r(\beta) = \alpha_r$ for some $\beta \in \bar{E}_r^{s-r, r-1}$. Since $\bar{E}_r^{s,t} = 0$ for $t \geq n$, we have $r \leq n$. Furthermore, since $E_r^{s,t} = 0$ for $0 < t < n$, we have $h(\beta) = 0$. Consequently,

$$h(\alpha_r) = h(d_r(\beta)) = \bar{d}_r(h(\beta)) = 0.$$

On the other hand, $E_2^{s,0} = E_3^{s,0} = \dots = E_n^{s,0}$ and $h(\alpha) = h(\alpha_2) = 0$. But this is impossible, because $h_2^{s,0}: E_2^{s,0} \rightarrow \bar{E}_2^{s,0}$ is the identity. $\square$

We will now use Theorem 5.1 to complement our results from [3].

Given a compact Lie group G , a G -space X , an orthogonal G -representation $\bar{U}$ such that $\bar{U}^G = \{0\}$, and a G -equivariant map $f: X \rightarrow \bar{U}$, set $\mathcal{Z}_f = \{x \in X \mid f(x) = 0\}$. A theorem of Bourgin–Yang type is one whose conclusion gives an estimate on the “size” of $\mathcal{Z}_f$, e.g. in terms of covering or cohomological dimension. (Here cohomological dimension will be denoted by $\text{cdim } X$ and taken with respect to Čech cohomology, i.e. $\text{cdim } X = \max\{n \geq 0 \mid \check{H}^n(X; \mathbb{Z}) \neq 0\}$.) For example, the classical Bourgin–Yang theorem states that if $f: S(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a map which satisfies $f(-x) = -f(x)$, then the dimension of $\mathcal{Z}_f$ is at least $n - m - 1$. In [3], we provided a number of Bourgin–Yang type theorems for various classes of groups, in particular for G a cyclic group of order p^k , a p -torus (p a prime), or a torus. However, our results for p -tori were not really satisfactory, and we did not cover the case $G = \mathbb{T}^k \times (\mathbb{Z}_p)^\ell$ at all. The former was fixed in a recent paper of Marzantowicz, de Mattos and dos Santos [16], provided that X is a representation sphere. Here we deal with the latter, in a slightly more general situation, namely when X is a homology sphere. (Recall that a *homology n -sphere* is a closed n -dimensional manifold having the integral homology groups of the n -sphere.) The idea of proof, however, is exactly the same as in [16].

Corollary 5.3. *Let X be a homology n -sphere, $n \geq 1$, and $\bar{U}$ an orthogonal G -representation such that $\bar{U}^G = \{0\}$. If $f: X \rightarrow \bar{U}$ is a G -equivariant map, then*

$$\text{cdim } \mathcal{Z}_f \geq n - \dim \bar{U}.$$

Proof. Set $m = \dim \bar{U}$ and assume without loss of generality that $n > m \geq 2$. Suppose, on the contrary, that $\text{cdim } \mathcal{Z}_f < n - m$. Then $\check{H}^i(\mathcal{Z}_f; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$ for $i > n - m - 1$. The long exact sequence of the pair $(X, X \setminus \mathcal{Z}_f)$ and Alexander duality thus give

$$H_i(X \setminus \mathcal{Z}_f; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_{i+1}(X, X \setminus \mathcal{Z}_f; \mathbb{Z}) \cong \check{H}^{n-i-1}(\mathcal{Z}_f; \mathbb{Z}) = 0 \text{ for } i < m.$$

In particular, $X \setminus \mathcal{Z}_f$ is path-connected. On the other hand,

$$H_i(\bar{U} \setminus \{0\}; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_i(S(\bar{U}); \mathbb{Z}) = 0 \text{ for } i \geq m.$$

But f restricts to a G -equivariant map $X \setminus \mathcal{Z}_f \rightarrow \bar{U} \setminus \{0\}$, which contradicts Theorem 5.1. $\square$

Acknowledgements. We wish to thank S. Jackowski for making his thesis available to us.

The first and second authors have been supported by the National Science Centre under grants 2014/12/S/ST1/00368 and 2015/19/B/ST1/01458, respectively. The third author has been supported by DST INSPIRE Scheme IFA-11MA-01/2011 and DST-RSF project INT/RUS/RSF/P-2.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Allday and V. Puppe, **Cohomological Methods in Transformation Groups**, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [2] A. H. Assadi, *Varieties in finite transformation groups*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 19 (1988), 459–463.
- [3] Z. Błaszczuk, W. Marzantowicz and M. Singh, *General Bourgin–Yang theorems*, arXiv:1512.02399, preprint (2015).
- [4] K. Borsuk, *Drei Sätze über die n -dimensionale euklidische Sphäre*, Fund. Math. 21 (1933), 177–190.
- [5] G. E. Bredon, **Introduction to Compact Transformation Groups**, Academic Press, New York, 1972.
- [6] M. Clapp and D. Puppe, *Critical point theory with symmetries*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 418 (1991), 1–29.
- [7] T. tom Dieck, *Kobordismentheorie klassifizierender Räume und Transformationsgruppen*, Math. Z. 126 (1972), 31–39.
- [8] T. tom Dieck, **Transformations Groups**, de Gruyter Series in Mathematics 8, Walter de Gruyter, 1987.
- [9] S. Jackowski, *Twierdzenia o lokalizacji i uzupelnianiu w ekwiwariantnych teoriach kohomologii*, PhD Thesis, 1976.
- [10] S. Jackowski, *The Euler class and periodicity of group cohomology*, Comment. Math. Helv. 33 (1978) 643–650.
- [11] K. Komiya, *Equivariant K -theory and maps between representation spheres*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. 31 (1995), 725–730.
- [12] K. Komiya, *Equivariant K -theoretic Euler classes and maps of representation spheres*, Osaka J. Math. 38 (2001), 239–249.
- [13] W. Marzantowicz, *A Borsuk–Ulam theorem for orthogonal $\mathbb{T}^k$ and $(\mathbb{Z}_p)^r$ actions and applications*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 137 (1989), 99–121.
- [14] W. Marzantowicz, *An almost classification of compact Lie groups with Borsuk–Ulam properties*, Pacific J. Math. 144 (1990), 299–311.

- [15] W. Marzantowicz, *Borsuk–Ulam theorem for any compact Lie group*, J. London Math. Soc. 49 (1994), 195–208.
- [16] W. Marzantowicz, D. de Mattos and E. L. dos Santos, *Bourgin–Yang versions of the Borsuk–Ulam theorem for p -toral groups*, arXiv:1302.1494, to appear in J. Fixed Point Theory Appl. (2017).
- [17] J. Matoušek, **Using the Borsuk–Ulam Theorem**, Springer, 2003.
- [18] R. T. Živaljević, *User’s guide to equivariant methods in combinatorics*, Publ. Inst. Math. Beograd 59 (1996), 114–130.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY OF POZNAŃ,
UL. UMULTOWSKA 87, 61-614 POZNAŃ, POLAND.

E-mail address: blaszczyk@amu.edu.pl

E-mail address: marzan@amu.edu.pl

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH (IISER) MOHALI, SECTOR 81, KNOWL-
EDGE CITY, SAS NAGAR (MOHALI), POST OFFICE MANAULI, PUNJAB 140306, INDIA.

E-mail address: mahender@iisermohali.ac.in